

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application.

Claim 12 is rejected under 37 CFR 1.75(c), first paragraph, as being of improper dependent form for claiming dependency to itself.

Claim 12 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 2, 12, and 14 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,911,061 ("Tochio et al.").

Claims 1-2, and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,651,225 ("Lin et al.").

Claims 1, 10-11, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0268288 ("Bajuk et al.").

Claims 3-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 12 is believed to be in compliance with the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Please note that in the specification, page 5, lines 22-25 state that

**Additionally, the techniques of the present invention can be used with other types of integrated circuits having a programmable portion, such as an ASIC with an embedded PLD.**

As is known to those skilled in the art, an application-specific integrated circuit, or ASIC, is an integrated circuit that is custom designed to perform a specific application and is not programmable. An ASIC is therefore disclosed in the specification as a non-programmable portion of an integrated circuit that may be implemented in combination with another portion of an integrated circuit that is programmable, such as an embedded PLD. For this reason, Applicants believe that the Examiner's rejection under U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is overcome and claim 12 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 12 has been amended to claim dependency to claim 11.

Claims 2, 12, and 14 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The allowability of claims 3-9 is gratefully acknowledged. Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8-12, and 14-16 have been amended. Applicants have amended independent claims 3, 6, and 16 to include subject matter the Examiner has indicated was allowable. These claims, along with all their dependent claims, are now in a condition for allowance.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-16, as amended, should be found to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that all pending and examined claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 8, 2006



Elaine K. Lee  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 41,936

101 Innovation Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134  
(408) 544-7591